



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/751,243	01/02/2004	Vladimir Marin	COS-971	3854
25264 7590 07/18/2008 FINA TECHNOLOGY INC PO BOX 674412 HOUSTON, TX 77267-4412				
EXAMINER				
LU, C CAIXIA				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1796				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/18/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****U.S. Patent and Trademark Office**

Address : COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
10751243	1/2/04	MARIN ET AL.	COS-971

FINA TECHNOLOGY INC
PO BOX 674412
HOUSTON, TX 77267-4412

EXAMINER

Caixia Lu

ART UNIT	PAPER
1796	20080711

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

The following summary is to clarify the examiner's position regarding the claims under review:

- (i) Claims 1, 3, and 10-12 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kaufmann et al. (US 5,770,752) and Schertl et al. (US 5,668,230) in dependently in the Final Office Action mailed August 30, 2006.
- (ii) Appellants' grounds of rejection to be reviewed in appeal are limited the rejection of claim 10 under Kaufmann and claims 10 and 12 over Schertl in the Appeal Brief filed January 30, 2007. Appellants have not make any amendment to change the ground of rejection to be reviewed.
- (iii) The rejection of claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Schertl is withdrawn by the examiner in Supplemental Amendment filed November 2, 2007.
- (iv) Currently, claims 1, 3, and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kaufmann et al. (US 5,770,752) and claims 1, 3, 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Schertl et al. (US 5,668,230). The grounds of rejections of claims 1, 3, 11, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kaufmann et al. (US 5,770,752) and the rejections of claims 1, 3, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Schertl et al. (US 5,668,230) have not been withdrawn by the examiner, but they are not under review on appeal because they have not been presented for review in the appellant's brief. However, since Appellant has traversed the rejection of claim 12 over Kaufmann in the the Reply Brief dated June 19, 2007, the examiner is now again including the rejection of claim 12 over Kaufmann in the attached second Supplemental Examiner's Answer for Board to review.

To Summerized the foregoing, it is the examiner's position that the rejections of claims 10 and 12 over Kaufmann and rejection of claim 10 over Schertl which are represented to board for review in the attached Supplemental Examiner's Answer and claims 1, 3, and 11 are cancelled by the attached Examiner's Amendment.

/David Wu/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1796

/Caixia Lu/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1796